28 ORDER - 1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

GEORGE T. HAWES, THIRD SET CAPITAL LLC, and ROSS PIRASTEH,

Plaintiff,

v.

KABANI & COMPANY, INC., and HAMID KABANI, an individual,

Defendant.

NO. C15-1956RSL

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE

This matter comes before the Court on "Defendants' Motion to Continue Trial Date." Dkt. # 33. Having reviewed the materials submitted by the parties, and the remainder of the record, the Court finds as follows.

Trial in this matter is currently set for March 6, 2017. Dkt. # 31 at 1. Defendants initially sought a June 2017 trial date, while plaintiffs requested a January 2017 trial date. Dkt. # 30 at 6. Following the Court's order setting the trial date, defendants properly contacted judicial assistant Teri Roberts to inform her of the conflict between the trial date and defendants' professional obligations. Dkt. # 31 at 2 ("If the trial date assigned to this matter creates an irreconcilable conflict, counsel must notify Teri Roberts, the judicial assistant, . . . within 10 days of the date of this Order and must set forth the exact nature of the conflict."); 35 at 2 ("On the afternoon of Tuesday, March 14, 2016, I called Ms. Roberts to notify her that Defendants have a conflict with the March 6, 2017 trial date because Defendants are accountants, and the trial date fell during tax season."). Defendants contacted plaintiffs, who would not agree to move the trial date, and this

motion followed. Dkt. #35 at 2.

The Court's scheduling order "may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The "good cause" inquiry "primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment." <u>Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.</u>, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). The Court may modify the schedule "if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension." <u>Id.</u> (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 advisory committee's notes). The "focus of the inquiry is upon the moving party's reasons for seeking the modification" but "the existence or degree of prejudice to the party opposing the modification might supply additional reasons to deny a motion . . . ." <u>Id.</u>

The Court finds that there is good cause to modify the scheduling order to move the trial date to June 2017. Defendants have been diligent in seeking this modification well in advance of the currently-set trial date and in accordance with the Court's directions in the order setting the trial date. While defendants should have identified their conflicts during tax season in the joint status report, they acted quickly to address the oversight once it became apparent. Dkt. # 14 (Order) at 4 ("Identify all calendaring conflicts that should be considered when setting a trial date."); Dkt. # 38 at 5 ("In hindsight, this information also should have been included in the Joint Status Report. As it was not, Defendants have complied with the procedure specifically set out in the Court's Minute Order Setting Trial Date."). In any case, it is not reasonable to expect defendants, who prepare corporate reports and tax returns for individuals and corporations, to prepare for and attend trial in the month that some corporate tax filings and 10-Ks are due and in the month before individual filings are due. See Dkt. # 34 (Declaration of Abdul Hamid Kabani) at 1-2. Although not the key inquiry, the Court has considered plaintiffs' asserted prejudice – less effective evidence and a greater risk of being unable to collect on a judgment rendered in their favor – and finds that the risk of prejudice due to a three-month extension is minimal.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS defendants' motion to continue the trial date (Dkt. # 33). The Court will issue a revised case management order reflecting the new trial date of June 5, 2017.

ORDER - 2

## Case 2:15-cv-01956-RSL Document 45 Filed 05/19/16 Page 3 of 3

28 ORDER - 3